Digicel Foundation Limited/USAID Enrichment Initiative to Increase Literacy at the Primary School Level

Semi-Annual Report: April 9, 2015 – October 10, 2015

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The Digicel programme seeks to address some of the over-arching issues surrounding the lack of performance of students in Jamaica's educational system with an emphasis on integrating technology and increased resources, student and teacher participation, as well as parental involvement. This will be accomplished by providing materials, training, and support necessary for the implementation of a literacy-focused intervention called the Enrichment Programme (EP) in Grades 1 to 3 in ninety-five (95) schools across Jamaica (project schools). More specifically, the project aims to establish thirty-five (35) Enrichment Centres (ECs), and to provide a total of sixty (60) Mobile Enrichment Carts (MECs) to primary schools over a three-year period. The project also seeks to provide training to a total of 190 teachers and to establish library corners in the ninety-five (95) schools engaged.

The first two (2) quarters (April 9 – October 10, 2015) of the approved Yr3 work plan saw the approval of a Modification 02 to the Grant Agreement on May 15, 2015 resulting in the following amendments:

- Increased value of the award by US$599,000;
- Extension of the award to December 31 2016;
- Expansion of the project scope to include more effective activities improving collaboration between home and school; and
- Establishment of seven (7) additional ECs (Cohort 4) to expand the project total to 104 schools with forty-three (43) to benefit from an EC and sixty-one (61) to receive a MEC.

During the reporting period Digicel Foundation (DF) made advancements in specific project deliverables including:
- The identification of the additional schools to receive ECs and the completion of rehabilitation works at six (6) of the seven (7) identified schools;
- The resulting introduction of the EP into the learning environment of an additional 6,075 students; and
- The training of sixty-two (62) teachers and meeting the cumulative three-year project target of 190 teachers trained.
- The training of sixty (60) additional principals

These along with other technical achievements will be expounded upon in this report.

The project faced various challenges in the implementation of the programme, including delays in renovations in the seven (7) schools as well as announcing the winners for the School of the Year Awards. With the support of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Ministry of Education (MoE), DF has been able to undertake various steps to address these challenges in the reporting period and looks forward to full resolution in the upcoming reporting period.

Key Technical Achievements

In the first two (2) quarters of the approved Yr3 work plan, the following key technical achievements have been made:

Project Management

➢ Approval of Annual Report for Yr2 of the project (April 1, 2014 – March 31, 2015);
➢ Approval of Cooperative Agreement Modification 02 on May 15, 2015;
➢ Approval of work plan and budget to the end of the project as per Modification 02 on May 28, 2015;
➢ Procurement approvals from the Agreement Officer (AO) for:
  o Contractor to carry out retrofitting works at seven (7) additional schools to receive ECs;
  o Learning resources for schools;
➢ Submission and approvals of all monthly SF-1034 financial reports for the reporting period;
➢ Submission of quarterly SF-425 financial report on May 18, 2015; and
➢ Submission of Yr 3 Q1 Quarterly Report on July 30, 2015.

Project Implementation

➢ Completion of retrofitting works at six (6) of the additional seven (7) schools to establish ECs;
➢ In-service training with sixty-two (62) teachers from schools of Cohorts 3 and 4 around the use and safety of resources provided through the project;
➢ Training of sixty (60) principals/school leaders in areas key to the management and of the school plant and specifically, implementation of the Enrichment Programme;
➢ Commencement of audit of Parents' Places and parental participation in governance in all 104 project schools;
➢ Complete establishment of seven (7) additional Library Corners;
➢ Shortlisting of schools to be nominated for School of the Year 2014 award;
➢ Completion of mid-line assessments of 444 students in Grades 1 and 2 at a representative sample of twenty-five (25) project schools; and
➢ Completion of first Summer School Student/Parent Intervention.

Report Detail

Outputs 1&2: Enrichment Centres (ECs) Established in Schools across the Island / Mobile Enrichment Carts (MECs) Distributed to Selected Schools across the Island

ECs are the original mechanism via which the EP is delivered in a school. These enhanced resource rooms are spaces, ideally the size of a typical class room, which are retrofitted to create an environment which is comfortable, stimulating, and print and technology rich. This space is used to support a pull out programme which is delivered through emersion sessions of thirty (30) to forty-five (45) minutes. Typically each student visits the centre two (2) to three (3) times per week. Ideally the students are pulled out in groups no more than fifteen (15) students and are grouped by age, grade, reading levels and/or educational needs. Students may also be scheduled for additional smaller group, or one-on-one, sessions based on their needs.

In order to provide a data-driven intervention that is tailored to the specific needs of the student, each child is assessed upon entering the programme. The findings of these assessments are used to inform the type of intervention students are provided with. ECs are equipped with various work areas, interactive audio-visual gadgets and manipulatives. They also contain child-friendly, ergonometric and colourful furniture that can be arranged to accommodate whole class, or group instruction and activities. Students can thus be assigned independently or within group activities under the supervision of the EC Manager.

During the successful establishment of thirty-six (36) ECs as documented in the approved Yr2 Annual Report, DF was able to achieve project savings. As such, on May 15, 2015 Cooperative Agreement Modification 02 was approved increasing the project scope to include an additional seven (7) ECs to be established with direct support from USAID.

Following consultation, it was recommended that all seven (7) additional ECs be established in Region 6 of the MoE. This is in keeping with the distribution of primary schools across the island. Region 6 is the largest education region in the island with the greatest numbers of schools, students and teachers. The MoE has for some time been in discussions around dividing Region 6 along parish lines to add a seventh region.

Identification and Approval of Project Schools
A shortlist of nine (9) potential schools was created based on a review of previously received applications, recommendations from the Office of Region 6, and MoE school data. On April 15, 2015, site visits were made to all nine (9) schools along with building officers attached to Region 6. The site visits were arranged to allow for meetings with school administrators as well as to assess the proposed spaces to host the EC in each school.

DF met with the Senior Education Officers and other representatives from the Office of Region 6 on May 12, 2015 to prioritise a list of seven (7) schools for submission to the Chief Education Officer, MoE, for final approval. On June 2, 2015, approval to engage these schools was received. On June 26, 2015, principals from all seven (7) schools met with the Regional Director and DF to further discuss the intervention and sign their Memoranda of Understanding.

The seven (7) additional schools are as follows:

School	Parish
Cross Primary	Clarendon
May Pen Primary	Clarendon
Osbourne Store Primary and Junior High	Clarendon
York Town Primary	Clarendon
Gregory Park Primary	St. Catherine
Linstead Primary and Junior High	St. Catherine
Old Harbour Bay Primary	St. Catherine

Procurement of Materials and Technological Equipment
Retrofitting Works:
To date, retrofitting works have been completed at six (6) of the seven (7) schools. Work at Old Harbour Bay Primary is scheduled to be completed during the next reporting period. In keeping with previously engaged schools, the retrofitting works that are undertaken to improve the learning environment in each school as is necessary can be seen outlined in the below table:

CATEGORY OF WORKS	DESCRIPTION
Internal Works (Walls, Grill etc.)	Installation of drywall partitions and ceiling consisting of sheet rock and concrete board. These are supported by required lumber. Dry walls and ceilings will include tape and plaster, and concrete board will be rendered with a mixture of cement and sand. Necessary insulation may be required for proper usage of air conditioning units. Grills and/or Doors will be installed for necessary security as required.
Flooring and Associated Works	Existing floors will be hacked for the supply, and installation of floor tiles embedded in thin-set and matching grout to joints.
Painting and Associated Works	Walls will be prepared, and primed for the application of two coats of low sheen emulsion paint.
Electrical/Air Conditioning and Associated Works	The electrical works will include the upgrading of existing supply. Items of works will consist of cutting of holes and chases (for conduits etc.) in walls, floors, and ceiling to accommodate all required electrical points including plugs, switches, lights, panel boxes, and the installation of Air Conditioning units.

The Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) for Cohorts 2, 4 and 3 will be completed during the next reporting period

Materials and Technological Equipment
DF has received approval for the procurement of learning resources for each of the seven (7) Cohort 4 schools to establish ECs. Delivery will commence in the upcoming reporting period. Procurement approval for furniture remains outstanding and will be completed in the next reporting period.

Library corners, including over 200 titles recommended by the MoE for guided and independent leisure reading, have been established in each of the seven (7) Cohort 4 schools. As with previous Cohorts, special attention was paid to cultural relevance, gender appropriate-ness and reading levels in the selection of the books to be provided.

Output 3: Teachers Trained in Literacy Curriculum and Use of Technology
The training aspect of the programme has two (2) components. The first is carried out by the MoE. It includes various sessions on the EP, its rationale and components. The training aims to empower teachers to better assist students to reach their fullest potential and to enhance the sustainability of the programme. To date, the targeted 190 teachers have been trained. The second component of the training aspect of the programme is a series of DF-coordinated individual or grouped sessions with teachers.

MoE Training
The MoE typically has two (2) three-day residential trainings for the academic year – one (1) over the Easter break (March – April), and one (1) in summer (June – July). These training sessions include the entire Cohort of schools and can have as many as 75 -100 participants. The training targets classroom teachers from Grades 1, 2 and 3 from schools with a MEC and Enrichment Centre Managers from schools with an EC. Other participants may include Principals and Vice Principals, Education Officers (EOs), and other Specialists from the MoE, partner representatives including USAID, and teachers from past beneficiary schools. This training is an intensive introduction to the programme including: assessment; record keeping; best practices; and instructional strategies best suited for the programme.

The project aims to provide each Cohort with two (2) opportunities for whole group interaction. Over the reporting period two (2) of these trainings took place as detailed below. This takes the total number of trainings completed to five (5) of the expected six (6) over the three years of the project.

Date	Location	Teachers/ Principals Present			Cohort
		Male	**Female**	**Total**	
July 13 – 15, 2015	Mandeville Hotel, Manchester	2	61	63	2 & 4
April 7 – 9, 2015	Shaw Park Hotel, St. Ann	4	60	64	3

At these trainings, a total of sixty-two (62) additional individuals were trained bringing the total teachers trained to 190[1].

---

[1] This figure is in keeping with the definition of the USAID standard indicator *Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants who successfully completed in-service training or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support*.

During these sessions, teachers benefitted from sessions let by MoE officers which focused on:
- The rationale of the Enrichment Programme;
- Effective implementation and best practices;
- Techniques for teaching literacy with a focus on early reading instruction;
- Planning and executing differentiated instruction;
- Programme monitoring and evaluation;
- Identifying and working with students with special needs, including recognising common learning, developmental and behavioural challenge; and
- Appropriate processes for making referrals.

The final upcoming MoE training is scheduled to take place in April 2016.

Following various interactions with stakeholders such as principals, teachers and MoE, principals were also brought together for a two- day seminar on institutional leadership focusing on the integration of the EP into broader school development plans. During this seminar, the responsibility of the schools, including the safeguarding, and maintenance of all materials provided was once again reinforced. Topics specific to the EP discussed included: inventory management; use and care of resources provided; management of the intervention; roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders; and teacher motivation. Details of this seminar can be seen below.

Date	Location	Principals Present			Cohort
		Male	Female	Total	
July 13 – 14, 2015	Club Hotel RIU, St. Ann	21	39	60	2, 3 & 4

In-service Trainings

The second training component is one (1) year of continuous in-service support coordinated by DF. With any training component especially with significant ICT-based aspects, it is important that sessions are designed to be effective. This consistent support coordinated by DF aims to empower teachers to practice the use and integration of the provided resources and methodologies into lesson planning and delivery. Training sessions are a mix of practical hands-on examples, activities, and the theory behind the use of technology integration. They sessions are specifically designed to address challenges in the education sector around inconsistent and weak lesson planning and delivery; use of teacher-centred teaching methods; and negligible use of information communication technology (ICT) equipment.

In-service trainings are carried out by suppliers; MoE officers; other technology or education specialists; and/or the DF Training Officer. During the reporting period a total of fifty-seven (57) hours of in-service training were carried out encompassing three separate trainings and reaching 171 teachers. Two (2) of these trainings targeted teachers from schools in Cohort 2, while one targeted teachers from schools in Cohort 3 and 4.

Teachers of Cohort 2 began implementing the programme in September 2014. Teachers from this Cohort had their last two monthly in-service sessions in April and May 2015. The teachers of Cohorts 3 and 4 began implementing the programme in September 2015. Their first monthly in-session trainings took place at the end of September 2015. Each session systematically and methodically explored the use of the materials provided by the project to ensure integration

into lesson planning. There are various advantages of this aspect of the training. The smaller group sizes allow for one-on-one interaction for the teachers with subject matter experts. The hands on nature of the trainings and emphasis of participatory / practical exercises also ensure that the teachers have the opportunity to put immediately put the areas covered into practise. Attendance at trainings has also been fairly good with the majority of all schools represented at each training session. Principals and Teachers have been asked to include an EP training in their weekly professional development sessions. This will allow for other classroom teachers to become familiar with the resources available and also integrate them into the teaching and learning process. This also helps to alleviate the challenges brought on by attrition.

As previously noted however, many teachers are unfamiliar with the ICT items and, more challengingly, hesitant to engage with them. As such the items may not be used as effectively as is possible in their classrooms. Despite this the feedback from teachers on the trainings programme has been largely positive commending the knowledge of the presenters and the relevance of the trainings. An independent assessment will be conducted in upcoming reporting periods to ascertain if teachers are effectively applying what was taught into their methods of instruction.

All trainings are detailed below.

Date	Topic(s) covered	Trainer	Location	Teachers trained		Hours
				Male	Female	
September 29 – October 1, 2015	Use and Care of Materials Provided	Coldax Mart Ltd.	Mico Teachers College, Kingston	2	59	24
May 19 – 21, 2015	Mimio - Reintroduction to the Mimio package (including hardware and software). Teachers were required to design a lesson using the Mimio and created activities and exercises to support these lessons.	Coldax Mart Ltd.	The Mandeville Hotel, Manchester	0	60	18
April 28 – 29, 2015	Literacy - The teachers were exposed to scaffolded spelling, syllable patterns, reading/writing connection and invented spelling.	MoE	The Mandeville Hotel, Manchester	2	48	15

Training Modules

In an effort to further enhance the sustainability of the programme, DF has undertaken to create training materials that can be distributed to all schools presently implementing in the EP. That includes the 104 schools identified through the DF/USAID Project as well as over 108 schools engaged prior to the beginning of this project. These will serve as a resource to school administrators and teachers responsible for the delivery of the EP. By providing this reference information, the project hopes to address areas of concern highlighted regarding the implementation of the EP as well as its sustainability. The concerns are listed below.

1. Teachers generally receive intense support and training only during their first year of delivering the programme. It is hoped that the provision of training modules on all key aspects of the programme will allow the teachers to be able to revisit training on aspects they find themselves having challenges with.
2. There have been various cases of redeployment and attrition of teachers in schools over the life of the project. As such schools can find themselves without trained teachers to implement the EP. It is hoped that the training resources provided will be used to train new teachers who have to step in for their colleagues on occasion, or take over the management of the programme.
3. The resource can be shared with all schools previously engaged in the programme that may be facing similar challenges around training, redeployment and attrition of identified school personnel implementing the programme. This allows for sustainability of the programme in schools.

During the reporting period, the first draft of a familiarisation and training manual for teachers and principals underwent rigorous review by various arms of the MoE and a final draft produced. The final draft is currently undergoing design changes by a graphics team for easy viewing and utilisation. The final document will be provided to all project schools during the later reporting periods.

Output 4: Improved Performance Outcomes of Direct Beneficiaries in ECs and MECs

This output looks at the intervention as it takes place in project schools. Monitoring these activities provides the project with an idea of how the programme is being implemented by teachers and principals as well as the achievements being made with regards to improvements in students' performance in reading. It also includes an award and recognition of notable work, which will serve to improve the promotion of success through the provision of incentives.

Year Awards

The School of the Year suite of awards seeks to highlight extraordinary participation in the project by various stakeholders. It has four components highlighting Schools, Teachers, Students, and Parents. The award schedule was conceptualised in collaboration with the MoE. It is hoped that the awards will incentivise all stakeholders to maintain a high standard of implementation and, in so doing, help maintain and improve the momentum of the EP.

The selection process for the 2014 awardees began in July 2015. Following assessment of termly reports submitted by schools of Cohort 2 over the course of the 2014/2015 academic year, four (4) schools were shortlisted. The top nominations for School of the Year under the EC and MEC categories were Treadlight and Thompson Town Primary Schools respectively. The MoE raised

concerns about the verification of protocols around school level data collection. DF and MoE are currently in consultations regarding how best to move forward. It is hoped that the Award will be issued in the upcoming reporting period.

Monitoring Student Performance

USAID Standard Indicator

Over the reporting period, the EP was introduced into the learning environment of an additional 6,075 students (3,050 boys and 3,025 girls), bringing the total to date to 43,075 students (22,715 boys and 20,360 girls[2]) therefore surpassing the project target of 40,000 students.

The project tracks the progress of two (2) samples of students engaged through the project. These students are taken from a representative sample of twenty-five (25) schools and will be assessed three (3) times over the course of the project. The sample schools represent just over twenty-five (25) percent of the original project target number of schools. Sample schools were selected with consideration for the type of intervention being implemented at the school (MEC/EC); the geographic spread of the project; and the breakdown of rural/urban locale of project schools. Students are assessed within the first month of beginning the intervention in order to establish a baseline against which to compare improvements in reading. Students are then assessed at the end of the academic year and finally at the end of their second year of involvement in the EP. Student grade reading levels are established using the USAID/MoE developed Early Reading Assessment Instrument (ERAI).

Following on from the baseline assessments carried out with 537 students in 2014, DF conducted individual assessments with a total of four 444 students from Grades 1 and 2 to establish mid-line values for the project between May 29 – June 18, 2015. Approximately seventeen percent (17%) of the originally assessed students were not available for the midline assessments. Students were not available either because they were absent from school on the day of the assessment or were no longer enrolled at the institution.

For the purpose of the USAID standard indicator[3] for USAID fiscal year FY2015 ending September 30 2015, the findings from Sample 1 will be used. This is detailed below:

---

[2] This figure is in keeping with the definition of the USAID standard indicator *Number of learners enrolled annually in primary schools and/or equivalent non-school based settings with USG support.*

[3] USAID standard indicator 3.2.1-27 - *Proportion of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level texts.*

Sample 1	Sample Baseline (%)	*Sample Midline (%)	Movement (%)
Total Students at/above Grade Level	14	32	18
Males at/above Grade Level	9	24	15
Females at/above Grade Level	20	44	24
Total Rural Students at/above Grade level	17	40	23
Rural Males at/above Grade level	13	31	18
Rural females at/above Grade level	22	52	30
Total urban students at/above Grade level	9	22	13
Total urban males at/above Grade level	4	17	13
Total urban females at/above Grade level	18	30	12

*Students giving midline results for Sample 1 completed Grade 2 and thus fit the definition of the USAID Indicator.

The sample baseline was established by carrying out assessments with approximately ten (10) Grade 1 student involved in the programme at each of the twenty-five (25) schools identified in the representative sample between February and March 2014. One hundred and twenty-eight (128) of these students were from schools which operate an EC, 100% of these 128 students were reading at pre-primer of below. In fact all but two (2) students, i.e., less than two percent (2%) of the assessed sample from EC schools, were non-starters reading below the pre-primer level. Of the total 269 students assessed, ninety-two percent (92%) of the students were reading at the pre-primer level or below. This reality is evidenced in the low baseline figure captured for students reading at grade level.

The table below shows the relative percentage of students reading at each level at the time of the baseline and a year and a half later: this project tracks the progress of the same group of students however approximately seventeen percent (17%) of the students assessed in the baseline were not available for midline assessments as they were absent or had transferred to another institution.

Grade level	% Of students					Total at Grade level or above
	BPP	PP	P	1	2 or above	
Baseline	84.6	7.5	1.5	5.2	1.1	N/A
End-line	50	14.9	9.9	15.3	9.9	N/A
% Change	34.6	7.4	8.4	10.1	8.8	18.9

The findings from Sample 2 of the students will be reported for USAID fiscal year FY2016 ending September 30, 2016. This sample is most in keeping with the definition of the indicator. The findings of Sample 1 have been in keeping with those of Sample 2 with regards to percentage movement of grade level student reading among sampled students and can be seen below.

Sample 2	Sample Baseline (%)	Sample Midline (%)	Movement (%)
% Total Students at/above Grade Level	6	25	19
% Males at/above Grade Level	5	20	15
% Females at/above Grade Level	8	33	25
% Total Rural Students at/above Grade level	10	29	19
% Rural Males at/above Grade level	8	22	14
% Rural females at/above Grade level	13	39	26
% Total urban students at/above Grade level	1	20	19
% Total urban males at/above Grade level	0	16	16
% Total urban females at/above Grade level	3	25	22

A review of the data shows that Sample 2 students showed an overall improvement of twenty percent (20%) in students reading at grade level following one year of intervention. A breakdown of student movement will be reported on for this sample once end-line figures have been ascertained.

Output 5 - Collaborative Responses between Home and School for Successful Academic Interventions

In keeping with Modification 02, the project received an additional US$599,000 to include more effective activities for improving collaboration between home and school. Under this output, the project will focus on three specific activities: supporting parental involvement in summer school activities; supporting partner schools in their ongoing parent engagement activities to include PTA meetings and other parental governance activities; and establishing Parents' Places at project schools.

Summer School Interventions

The first Summer School intervention took place July 6 – 23, 2015 at a randomly selected twenty-five (25) project schools across the island. The intervention reached a total of 500 students (283 boys and 217 girls) transitioning from Grade 1 to 2 that were in need of additional support in literacy. The intervention included a prescribed schedule of daily activities with students and various opportunities for parental participation and support such as mommy/ daddy and me days, orientation for parents and children, and an open day for parents to view their children's accomplishments on the last day of school.

DF provided all schools with supporting materials to guide the execution of the summer school intervention as well as funding, calculated on a per student basis, in order to allow them to host the intervention. Funding covered stipends for teachers and support staff as well as breakfast and lunch for students daily.

There was overall positive feedback from teachers, principals, and parents around the relevance of the Summer School intervention. Teachers noted that providing food for the students was a big attraction. In some cases, schools were able to capitalise on the opportunity presented by the intervention to invite pre-Grade 1 students to attend summer school. School administrators noted that this would give the teachers and students an opportunity to familiarise themselves with each other, and in most cases provide much needed groundwork ahead of the students primary school career as many incoming students are not Grade 1 ready when they begin primary school.

Feedback from the schools noted various successes. For example, teachers at Spring Garden Primary in Trelawny noted improvement in students' penmanship, and blending and pronunciation. Teachers at Cavaliers All Age in St. Andrew noted that two (2) of their non-starters had begun to sound out letters and read at the pre-primer stage. Claremont All Age in St. Ann reported great successes with their Rent-A-Book activity in which students took books home then presented a report to their class mates. Three students in particular were very excited and were able to share their stories with no assistance from their teachers while one of their students who was dependent at the beginning of the intervention excelled over the three week learning over ten (10) new words. Aeolus Valley Primary highlighted the importance of parental support noting that when a father attended the second parents' day, his son, who is generally quite shy, participated in all activities and was very attentive.

Nonetheless, teachers noted various challenges including insufficient time to prepare, short notice to engage parents, irregular or poor attendance at summer school including tardiness, and, in various cases, insufficient support from parents. Various schools also had challenges using the ERAC limiting DF's ability to collect verifiable quantitative data on student performance over the three (3) weeks. Teachers thus suggested additional guidelines on the use of the ERAC be provided ahead of any future summer school activities. Teachers also suggested that the intervention be extended and that strategies to engage parents be added. The strategies to engage parents included: workshops to teach parents to make educational materials at home; incentives for students based on assistance they receive at home; and an "I Learn You Learn" programme for parents to attend gearing to improve their knowledge to assist their children.

Situational Analysis in Partner Schools
In keeping with Modification 02, the project will seek to support partner schools in their ongoing parent engagement activities with an aim of supporting governance structures in forty (40) project schools and establishing Parents' Places at all 104 project schools. DF has engaged a parenting specialist, Jennifer Brown, to oversee the projects efforts to conduct a situation analysis to identify suitable schools in order to: prioritise forty (40) schools in need of PTA or governance support; ascertain specific requirements to establish Parents' Places and; discover other critical areas for parental engagement/support.

Under her supervision, and in partnership with the National Parenting Support Commission (NPSC), an assessment tool was developed to ensure that situational analyses carried out in the project schools are done in an objective and systematic manner. A team of officers with previous experience working in primary schools has also been engaged to assist in carrying out the situational analyses. The results of these analyses should be presented within the next

reporting period so as to allow DF to identify the forty (40) schools to be prioritised, and the most effective areas for engagement and support in each case. The results of the assessment will also allow DF to begin procurement of the items needed to establish Parent's Places in each school.

Output 6 - Effective Management of the Project

The project engaged in various activities to ensure the best possible implementation and sustainability of the project. Achievements under this output include Modification 02 to the cooperative agreement to expand the scope of the project; the establishment of a Project Advisory Committee to oversee the sustainability of the programme; and the submission and approval of various project documents in keeping with the Cooperative Agreement.

Oversight by DF Team

Beyond ensuring that the project is being executed in keeping with the cooperative agreement, DF has consistently sought to maximise support for, and outcomes of, the programme with an end to ensuring that students engaged in the programme are afforded the best possible opportunities to succeed. One way in which this has been significantly enhanced, is the expansion of the project scope to include (a) seven (7) additional schools and (b) more targeted support for parental empowerment and involvement in the school environment through the Modification 02 previously mentioned in this report. As noted, this modification specifically includes:

- Increase in value of the award by US$599,000;
- Extension of the award to 31 December 2016;
- Expansion of the project scope to include more effective activities improving collaboration between home and school including the support of governance structures in forty (40) schools and the establishment of Parents' Places in all project schools; and
- Establishment of 7 additional Enrichment Centres (Cohort 4) to expand the project to 104 schools with forty-three (43) to benefit from an EC and sixty-one (61) to receive a MEC.

The modification was approved on May 15, 2015. Since then DF has moved steadfastly to see that all additional project activities are carried out in order to ensure that all additional objectives are met.

A work plan and budget in keeping with the Modification 02, was approved by USAID on May 28, 2015. The Year 2 Annual Report submitted to USAID on April 29, 2015 was formally accepted by USAID on July 29, 2015. DF has also submitted an updated Performance Management Plan to USAID on September 11, 2015. This will be revised in light of additional standard indicators which will be reported on going forward and resubmitted to USAID in the upcoming reporting period.

DF, MoE and USAID have held regular monthly implementation meetings over the course of the reporting period. At these meetings, held on April 24, May 22, June 26, July 24, August 21, and September 18, 2015, all parties shared updates and feedback on project activities and

deliverables. The Project Advisory Committee also held its first meeting, chaired by Deputy Chief Education Officer Lena Buckle-Scott on June, 17 2015. This was followed by a second quarterly meeting on September 13, 2015.

The Project Advisory Committee is expected to work collaboratively to generate and monitor useful strategies to ensure the project's resources are utilised in the most effective ways. In addition, the Committee will look beyond the project end date and with an eye to ensuring the sustainability of the programme. In addition to Mrs. Lena Buckle-Scott, representatives from USAID and the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ) also sit on the Committee. Additional representatives will be invited to join the Committee by the Chair for future meetings.

Site Visits

The project team also makes site visits to project schools. These site visits can be unsolicited, or in response to highlighted issues on the ground. They provide the opportunity for the project team to engage directly with the principals and teachers involved in the programme and vice versa, which helps sustain buy-in from all parties. These visits also allow the project team to observe how the programme is being implemented in schools, and offer additional support where possible. During monitoring site visits, classes may be observed; inventory lists, student records and lesson plans may also be reviewed. Over the reporting period, a total of eighty-three (83) site visits were made to schools involved, or hoping to become involved, in the programme as detailed in the below table.

Date	School	Purpose
15 April 2015	Gregory Park Primary – St. Catherine	Site visit to Region 6 schools to engage principals and assess whether schools meet minimum requirements for establishing an Enrichment Centre
	Linstead Primary and Junior High – St. Catherine	
	Old Harbour Bay Primary – St. Catherine	
	Old Harbour Primary – St. Catherine	
	White Marl Primary and Junior High – St. Catherine	
	Cross Primary – Clarendon	
	May Pen Primary – Clarendon	
	Osbourne Store Primary – Clarendon	
	York Town Primary – Clarendon	
6 May 2015	Wilson's Run Primary – Trelawny	Read Across Jamaica Day activities and opening of Resource Room
6 May 2015	St. Andrew Primary – Kingston and St. Andrew (KSA)	Site visit with visiting Senior Deputy Administrator, USAID/LAC Office
8 May 2015	John Mills Primary and Junior High – KSA	Delivery of desktop computers and verification of inventory
	Norman Gardens Primary – KSA	
	St. Andrew Primary – KSA	
	St. Anne's Primary – KSA	
12 May 2015	St Mary's All Age (for assistance with one	

	computer which was not working) –St. Catherine	
	St. Anne's Primary – KSA	
	Stony Hill Primary Infant and All Age – KSA	
	John Mills Primary and Junior High – KSA	
13 May 2015	Annotto Bay Primary – St. Mary	
	St. Benedict's Primary – KSA	
	Yallahs Primary – St. Thomas	
22 May 2015	Milk River Primary – Clarendon	Site visit to assess the intervention in schools
	Gimme-me-bit Primary – Clarendon	
22 May 2015	Treadlight Primary – Clarendon	To participate in official opening of Enrichment Centre
29 May 2015	Horizon Park – St. Catherine	Site visits to conduct ERAI Assessments
	Friendship Primary – St. Catherine	
1 June 2015	McAuley Primary – St. Catherine	
2 June 2015	Chandler's Pen Primary – Clarendon	
3 June 2015	Crescent Primary – St. Catherine	
4 June 2015	Claremont Primary – St. Ann	
9 June 2015	Windsor Castle All Age - Portland	
	Brampton All Age – Trelawny	
	Falmouth All Age – Trelawny	
10 June 2015	Adelphi Primary – St. James	
	Bethel Primary – Hannover	
	Lucea Primary – Hannover	
	Cove Primary – Hannover	
11 June 2015	Sheffield Primary – Westmoreland	
	Little London Primary – Westmoreland	
	Petersfield Primary – Westmoreland	
16 June 2015	Mile Gully Primary – Manchester	
	Mount Olivet Primary – Manchester	
	Robins Hall All Age – Manchester	
17 June 2015	Lititz All Age – St. Elizabeth	
	Bethlehem All Age and Infant – St. Elizabeth	
18 June 2015	Hayes Primary and Junior High – Clarendon	
	Race Course Primary – Clarendon	
	Milk River Primary – Clarendon	
	Gimme-me-bit Primary – Clarendon	
23 June 2015	Norman Garden's Primary – KSA	Delivery of material and equipment and verification of inventory
29 June 2015	Golden Spring Primary – KSA	
30 June 2015	Free Hill Primary – St. Mary	

1 July 2015	Norman Garden's Primary – KSA	Delivery Laptop Computers
	Golden Spring Primary – KSA	
	Free Hill Primary – St. Mary	
6 July 2015	St. Benedict's Primary – KSA	Monitoring visits made to schools carrying out Summer School Intervention
	Norman Gardens Primary and Junior High – KSA	
	Rennock Lodge Primary – KSA	
8 July 2015	Cavaliers All Age – KSA	
	Norman Gardens Primary and Junior High – KSA	
15 July 2015	Boscobel Primary – St. Mary	
	Annotto Bay Primary – St. Mary	
8 July 2015	Cedar Grove Academy – St. Catherine	Visit by training officer to observe USAID Camp Summer Plus intervention
21 July 2015	John Mills Primary and Junior High – KSA	Follow up delivery of outstanding items and verification of inventory
	Yallahs Primary – St. Thomas	
	St. Anne's Primary – KSA	
	St. Benedict's Primary – KSA	
22 July 2015	Annotto Bay Primary – St. Mary	
	Hampstead Primary – St. Mary	
	Mason Hall Primary – St. Mary	
	Orange Bay Primary – Portland	
	Rural Hill Primary – Portland	
22 July 2015	Norman Gardens Primary and Junior High – KSA	Follow up visits made to schools carrying out Summer School intervention
	Rennock Lodge Primary – KSA	
	St. Benedict's Primary – KSA	
23 July 2015	Bryce Primary – Manchester	Monitoring visit to schools carrying out Summer School Intervention
	Friendship Primary – St. Catherine	
2 September 2015	Gregory Park Primary – St. Catherine	Site visits to review ongoing works at Cohort 4 ECs and to update school administrators on the implementation of the programme at their schools
	Cross Primary – Clarendon	
	York Town Primary – Clarendon	
	Osbourne Store Primary – Clarendon	
	May Pen Primary – Clarendon	

Public Relations and Communications:

The project was featured in the print and online media twenty-three (23) times including features, and coverage of various project related activities. The Social Media Platforms of the Digicel Group also featured the programme, including their in electronic magazines and newsletters.

External Audit

One recommendation coming out of the successful external audit of the first year of the project was the creation of an asset management registry for each of the schools with ECs. This has been completed. Signed detailed asset inventories can be found adjoined to this report. The external audit of the second year of the implementation of the project is scheduled to take place in the upcoming reporting period.

Financial Report: April 1, 2015 – September 30, 2015

Programme Budget

USAID approved a total budget of *US$1,968,000* for the three-year **Cooperative Agreement AID-532-13-00003 Enrichment initiative to Increase Literacy at the Primary Level** commencing implementation on April 9, 2013. This sum is equivalent to *J$194,832,000* when calculated at an exchange rate of *J$99.* Modification 01 was approved by the Agreement Officer during the previous annual reporting period on November 14, 2014 including a full translation of the budget into Jamaica Dollars. Using the applicable USAID exchange rate as at November 14, 2014, as well as including an allocation of exchange rate savings in the sum of *J$14,355,863*, the modification resulted in a total USAID obligation of *J$209,187,861*.

Modification 02 was approved by the Agreement Officer during the reporting period on May 14, 2015. The modification resulted in a budget increase of *US$599,000* to a new total USAID obligation of *US$2,567,000*. This sum is equivalent to *J$277,413,961* when calculated at the USAID exchange rate applicable rate at May 14, 2015.

Exchange Rates

Based on figures from the Bank of Jamaica (BoJ) during the reporting period, the United States Dollar monthly average exchange rates devalued from *J$115.17* for the month ending April 2015 to *J$115.34* in the month ending September 2015. This is an average exchange rate of *J$113.15* over the entire period.

USAID Budgeted vs Actual Receipts and Expenditure

Receipts from USAID over the reporting period amounted to *J$26,126,731*.49. This amounts to 19% of the overall 18-month Yr3 budget and work plan. Expenditure over the same period amounted to *J$32,846,338.32* and represents 24% of the Yr3 budget. Total expenditure for the project as at September 30, 2015 summed to *J$172,496,280.68*. This represents a disbursement of 62% of the new overall budget of the project following Modification 02 (See Table 2 below).

Counterpart Funding

Based on the Host Country Contribution (HCC) accepted by USAID, the GoJ contribution to the project over the reporting period was J$281,388,906.00. The total spend for the reporting period for Digicel Foundation (DF), USAID and GoJ was J$337,095,146.70*.

The GoJ overall project contribution as at September 30, 2015 was J$574,382,317.00. Overall expenditure of the project (April 9, 2013 to September 30, 2015) for all DF, MoE and USAID was J$865,035,663.29*.

The contribution per counterpart over the year-to-date period as at September 30, 2015 is outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Counterpart	Overall Project Contribution as at March 31, 2015 (J$)	Contribution over the reporting period April 1, 2014 to September 30, 2015 (J$)	Overall Project Contribution as at September 30, 2015 (J$)
USAID	139,649,941.86	32,846,338.32	172,496,280.68
GoJ	292 ,993,411.00	281,388,906.00	574,382,317.00
DF	95,297,163.23	22,859,902.38	118,157,065.61
Total	**527,940,516.09**	**337,095,146.70**	**865,035,663.29**

Table 2

Comparison of Programme Budget to Advances and Expenditure as at September 30, 2015

Line Item	Approved Budget after Mod 02 (US$)	Approved Budget after Mod 02 (J$)	USAID 3rd Year Budget (J$)	Cumulative Expenditure as at March 2015 (J$)	Advances for Reporting Period (J$)	EXPENDITURE (J$) Yr3 Q1 Apr – Jun 2015	Q2 Jul – Sep 2015	Total	Cumulative Expenditure as at September 2015 Total	Project Budget Balance (J$)
Personnel	291,250.00	51,390,214.20	32,476,752.99	18,913,461.21	**7,608,607.59**	2,601,749.86	2,956,640.73	**5,558,390.59**	24,471,851.80	**26,918,362.40**
Travel	17,750.00	333,946.62	0.00	333,946.62	**0.00**				333,946.62	**0.00**
Equipment	1,590,000.00	154,233,337.91	38,189,741.70	116,043,596.21	**8,503,970.88**	7,593,375.95	5,767,595.51	**13,360,971.46**	129,404,567.67	**24,828,770.24**
Supplies	3,000.00	150,862.55	0.00	150,862.55	**0.00**	0.00	0.00	**0.00**	150,862.55	**0.00**
Contractual	66,000.00	8,447,304.00	6,778,280.00	1,669,024.00	-20,372.98	0.00	3,979,976.27	**3,979,976.27**	5,649,000.27	**2,798,303.73**
Capacity Building	0.00	2,539,051.77	60,319,243.95	2,539,051.77	**0.00**	0.00	0.00	**0.00**	2,539,051.77	**0.00**
Other	599,000.00	60,319,243.95	0.00	0.00	**10,034,526.00**	0.00	9,947,000.00	**9,947,000.00**	9,947,000.00	**50,372,243.95**
Total	**2,567,000.00**	**277,413,961.00**	**137,764,018.64**	**139,649,942.36**	**26,126,731.49**	**10,195,125.81**	**22,651,212.51**	**32,846,338.32**	**172,496,280.68**	**104,917,680.32**

Scheduled Audit

A financial audit of Yr2 (April 1, 2014 – March 31, 2015) of the project was commissioned in the reporting period. The selected auditor is BDO Chartered Accountants. The audit begins November 2, 2015.

Challenges/ Issues that have Affected Implementation and Solutions Implemented / Recommendations to Address Same

1. As noted in the preceding quarterly report, the Principals and school administrators of many under-performing schools identified through the project continued to show a lack of ownership of the Enrichment Programme. Principals are key stakeholders in ensuring the necessary monitoring takes place at the school level for the Enrichment Programme's effectiveness. In order to provide additional support to these Principals and School Administrators, DF organised a Principal Sensitisation & Leadership Forum on July 13 – 14, 2015. The sessions were led primarily by the National College for Educational Leadership (NCEL) and the Jamaica Teaching Council (JTC) and built around improving instructional leadership and programme sustainability. DF also led a session focusing specifically on the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders (Enrichment Programme teachers, School Principals/Administrators and Parents), in ensuring effectiveness of the intervention.

2. Based on the scope of works needed at Old Harbour Bay Primary in Cohort 4, the completion of renovations at this final school have been delayed. Works at this school are scheduled to be completed in the upcoming reporting period. In the interim, DF has engaged the Enrichment Centre Manager in trainings and received approval for the learning manipulatives to be placed in the EC once renovations are completed.

Lessons Learned

Lessons learned in this report centre mainly around the implementation of the Summer School Interventions. In keeping with the recommendations of the teachers, parents and MoE principal takeaways include:

o Approve schools for Summer school earlier to allow more notice to plan for the intervention. This will allow schools to engage the most appropriate teachers to carry out the intervention. It will also allow more time for teachers to engage parents to ensure consistent student attendance and parent participation.
o Extend the duration of summer school in order to allow more time for engagement with the students.
o Teachers and principals found the guidelines provided by DF to be immensely useful and appropriate in guiding their activities. Teachers are best engaged once presented with a clear plan of action. A Grade One Summer School Manual will be produced to maintain standards of lesson preparation and resource utilisation.

     o   Train teachers in the use of ERAC in order to eliminate inconsistencies with the use of the Early Reading Assessment Checklist (ERAC) used by teachers in partner schools. Encourage improved understanding of the ERAC as well as other MoE reading instruments during monthly in-service sessions and other engagements with teachers.

Success Stories

DF learned that Orlando Scarlett of Petersfield Primary and one of the awardees of the Student of the Year 2013, successfully mastered the Grade Four Literacy Test in the 2015 sitting. Orlando first entered the programme in 2013 as a Grade 3 student. At that time he was reading at the pre-primer level and displaying few age-appropriate social skills. After one year of EP support, Orlando moved three (3) grade levels and was reading at the Grade 1 level, and showing much improvement. After he moved into Grade 4, he continued to receive additional support from the Enrichment Centre Manager and volunteers and was happily able to improve the additional grade levels to sit, and master the exam.

Upcoming Activities

Upcoming activities for the quarter October to December 2015 include:

- Completion of Situational Analysis in schools regarding parental involvement;
- Identification of forty (40) schools to receive support for PTA / Governance structures;
- Delivery of materials and equipment to Cohort 4 ECs;
- Continuation of in-service training for teachers from cohorts 3 and 4 schools;
- Finalisation of familiarisation and training manual for teachers and principals;
- Quarterly meeting of the Advisory Committee;
- Selection of awardees for School and Teacher of the Year; and
- Submission of updated Performance Management Plan.

Appendices

Appendix I – USAID Performance Indicators

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS Indicators	Unit	Disag	2013-2014			2014-2015			2015-2016			CUMILATIVE TOTAL	
			Baseline	Target	Actual	Baseline	Target	Actual	Baseline	Target	YTD Actual	Target	Actual
Number of teachers/ educators/ teaching assistants who successfully completed in-service training or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support	Number	Male	Zero	3	3	Zero	8	7	Zero	8	6	19	16
		Female	Zero	65	65	Zero	53	53	Zero	53	56	171	174
		Total	**Zero**	**68**	**68**	**Zero**	**61**	**60**	**Zero**	**61**	**62**	**190**	**190**
Number of learners enrolled annually in primary schools and/or equivalent non-school based settings with USG support	Number	Male	Zero	6,525	7,137	Zero	6,738	6,710	Zero	6,738	8,120	20,001	21,715
		Female	Zero	6,525	7,302	Zero	6,737	5,582	Zero	6,737	8,224	19,999	20,360
		Total	**Zero**	**13,050**	**14,439**	**Zero**	**13,475**	**12,292**	**Zero**	**13,475**	**16,344**	**40,000**	**43,075**
Proportion of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text	%	Male	9.2[4]	5.0[5]	N/A	N/A	Zero	12.2	24.6	Zero	8	N/A	N/A
		Female	20.4	8.3	N/A	N/A	Zero	24.4	43.8	Zero	12.3	N/A	N/A
		Total	**13.7**	**6.4**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**Zero**	**17.2**	**32.3**	**Zero**	**9.9**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support	Number	Male	Zero	N/A	N/A	Zero	N/A	N/A	Zero	N/A	N/A	N/A	21
		Female	Zero	N/A	N/A	Zero	N/A	N/A	Zero	N/A	N/A	N/A	39
		Total	**Zero**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**Zero**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**Zero**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**60**
Number of PTAs or similar school governance structures supported	Number	**Direct**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**Zero**	**40**		**40**	

[4] Baseline for Sample 1 students who began grader 1 in the academic year 2013/2014 and thus finish two years of primary education in June 2015

[5] Baseline for Sample 1 students who began grader 1 in the academic year 2014/2015 and thus finish two years of primary education in June 2016

Appendix II – Expected Outcomes, Outputs, Related Activities, Indicators and Numbers for the Three Year Project

***N/A denotes an inability of DF to quantify a specific indicator based on information gathered.

Project Outcomes:						
1. Intervention remedies that identify skill-gap of each student enrolled in programme thereby facilitating better performance outcomes 2. Increased teacher capacity in the delivery of literacy instruction 3. Increased teacher capacity in the identification and support for at-risk learners and/or special needs students						
Output 1	**Activity**	**Standard indicator**	**Target**	**Baseline Situation**	**Actual**	**Data needed (to measure change)**
Enrichment Centres established in schools across the island	Launch of project	Project launched	1	Zero	1	Press release; media features
	Call out for applications to schools interested in the EI Center through various communication channels.	Call for applications launched annually	3	Zero	2	Call for Application; Application Guidelines; Application Form; press release; media features;
		Number of applications approved	35	Zero	43	Signed MoUs with Schools
	Consult with the MOE to determine schools that are in need of intervention (based on established criteria)	MOE and DF meetings held	15	N/A	16	List of shortlisted schools (site visit forms, emails from Regional offices or central ministry with suggested schools and approving final shortlist)
	Select schools based on established criteria:	School selected for EC intervention	35	Zero	3	Grant agreement signed by Principal; Implementation plan developed and instituted.
	Procurement of materials and technological equipment.	EC materials and equipment procured and installed	N/A	N/A	N/A	Financial supporting documents; contract to supplier; fixed asset registry; press release; media features; pictures
	Design School of the Year competition	Award criteria developed	1	Zero	1	Award criteria; award guidelines; list of shortlisted candidates
		Award issued	3	Zero	1	Finance supporting documents; pictures; press releases, media features
Output 2	**Activity**	**Standard indicator**	**Indic. #**	**Baseline**		**Data needed**

				Situation		(to measure change)
	Call out for applications to schools interested in MECs through various communication channels.	Call for applications launched annually	3	Zero	2	Call for Application; Application Guidelines; Application Form; press release; media features;
		Number of applications approved	60	Zero	61	Signed MoUs with schools
	Consult with the MOE to determine schools that are in need of intervention (based on established criteria)	MOE and DF meeting held	15	N/A	15	list of shortlisted schools (emails from Regional offices or central ministry with suggested schools and approving final shortlist)
Mobile Enrichment Carts distributed to selected schools across the island	Select schools based on established criteria:	School selected for MEC intervention	60	Zero	61	Signed grant agreement by Principal; Implementation plan developed and instituted.
	Procurement of materials and technological equipment.	MEC materials and equipment procured and delivered	N/A	N/A	N/A	Financial supporting documents; contract to supplier; fixed asset registry; press release; media features; pictures
	Design School of the Year competition	Award criteria developed	1	Zero	1	Award criteria; award guidelines; list of shortlisted candidates
		Award issued	3	Zero	1	Finance supporting documents; pictures; press releases, media features
Output 3	**Activity**	**Standard indicator**	**Indic. #**	**Baseline Situation**		**Data needed (to measure change)**
Teacher trained in literacy curriculum and use of technology	MOE to conduct literacy training sessions to equip teachers with skills to identify and improve intervention strategies to address learning challenges in classrooms	Number of training sessions conducted	6	N/A	5	Registration sheets; training curriculum; meeting agenda; training report; training evaluation
		Number of participants registered and completed training	190	N/A	190	Registration sheets
	Supplier to conduct in-service trainings on use of computer software programmes.	Number of person hours of teachers receiving in-service training in computer literacy software (Average training time	190	Zero	260.5	Contract to supplier; registration sheets; training curriculum; training schedule; training evaluation; school reports

	Activity	Standard indicator	Indic. #	Baseline Situation		Data needed (to measure change)
				= 1 hour)		
	Supplier to conduct in-service training programme on use of equipment	Number of person hours of teachers receiving in-service training on equipment use (Average training time = 1 hour)	190	Zero	243.5	Contract to supplier; registration sheets; training curriculum; training schedule; training evaluation; school reports
	Facilitate site-based in-service platform to allow participating teachers to share strategies learned and used in the EI.	Number of testimonials/ideas received and shared	85	Zero		Site visit reports; school reports; intervention logs; meeting reports;
	Develop training modules for upload unto laptops.	Training modules developed and uploaded unto laptops	N/A	Zero		REO site visit reports; supplier in-service reports;
	Design Teacher of the Year competition	Award criteria developed	1	Zero	1	Award criteria; award guidelines; list of shortlisted candidates
		Award issued	3	Zero	1	Finance supporting documents; pictures; press releases, media features

Output 4	Activity	Standard indicator	Indic. #	Baseline Situation		Data needed (to measure change)
Improved performance outcomes of direct beneficiaries in ECs and MECs	Establish library corners	Number of library corners established	95	N/A	104	Finance supporting documents; fixed asset registry; pictures; press releases, media features
	Refer underperforming students to EC teacher	Number of student referral form signed and submitted to EC teacher *(assuming 50 students/yr/school)*	3,450	N/A	4,732	Termly reports from EC managers on students in programme
	Assess student and develop individual intervention plan for EC students	Number of baselines of each student's performance identified	3,450	N/A	2,010	Baseline reports
		Number of individual intervention plans developed per student	3,450	N/A		Intervention plans
	Deliver programme to diagnosed students in EC by teacher	Number of students enrolled	3,450	N/A	2,405	Enrolment list; baseline reports; intervention plans
	Establish intervention log to diagnosed students in EC by teacher	Number of intervention logs recorded per student	3,450	N/A		Intervention logs
	Student self-evaluation form of EC and	Number of student self-	10,600	N/A	195	Evaluation sheets

	Activity	Standard indicator	Indic. #	Baseline Situation		Data needed (to measure change)
	MEC students	evaluations conducted.				
	Prepare reports for EC and MEC students' progress	Number of reports prepared and submitted to DF and REOs (assuming 50 students/EC/yr and 60 students/MEC/yr accumulated over 3 years as described in Appendix 1)	10,600	N/A		School reports; intervention plans (MEC reports on baseline of students per grade)
	Assess students at least once per term		10,600	N/A	5,924	
	MOE to conduct assessment of teachers	Number of site visits by REOs	190	N/A		REO site visit reports; site visit check list
		Number of reports submitted to DF and MOE	190	N/A		
	Design Student of the Year competition	Award criteria developed	1	Zero	1	Award criteria; award guidelines; list of shortlisted candidates
		Award issued	3	Zero	1	Finance supporting documents; pictures; press releases, media features
Output 5	**Activity**	**Standard indicator**	**Indic. #**	**Baseline Situation**		**Data needed (to measure change)**
Collaborative responses between home and school for successful academic interventions	Conduct sensitisation workshops for parents	Number of parents attending sensitisation workshops	3,930	Zero	1,218	Registration sheets; meeting agenda; (assuming 21% attrition rate of project target of 5000 parents)
	Distribute parent partnership forms	Number of signed parent partner forms returned	3,930	Zero		School reports; Signed parent partnership forms
	EI teachers host monthly progress meetings/individual sessions with parents	Number of parents attending monthly progress meetings//individual sessions	3,930	Zero	270	School reports; Registrations sheets; REO site visit reports;
	Design of Parent of the Year competition	Award criteria developed	1	Zero	1	Award criteria; award guidelines; list of shortlisted candidates
		Award issued	3	Zero	1	Finance supporting documents; pictures; press releases, media features
Output 6	**Activity**	**Standard indicator**	**Indic. #**	**Baseline Situation**		**Data needed (to measure change)**

Effective management of the project	Oversight by DF team	Number of staff evaluations conducted	18	N/A	12	Staff contracts; staff appraisals
	Conduct monitoring visits by DF team	Number of person hours of mentoring given during site visits (Average visit time = 1 hour)	360	N/A	259	DF staff site visit reports
	Organise steering committee monthly meetings with DF, MOE & USAID representatives	Number of meetings held	36	Zero	11	Meeting notes; meeting agenda; registration sheets (G2G meetings How should I report on these now that we have our own committee?
	Compile DF monthly technical and financial reports	Number of reports prepared, signed and filed	36	N/A	30	Filed reports (to be signed and filed)
	Compile quarterly USAID technical and financial reports	Number of reports prepared, signed and submitted to USAID in a timely manner	12	Zero	9	Filed reports (one AR)
	Bi-annual meetings with USAID	Number of meetings held	6	Zero		Meeting notes; meeting agenda; registration sheets
	Prepare technical and financial files for annual, external audit	Annual audit conducted	3	Zero	1	Auditor contract; audit report

Appendix III – Regions of the Ministry of Education

REGION	PARISHES
1	Kingston & St. Andrew
2	St. Thomas, Portland & St. Mary
3	St. Ann & Trelawny
4	St. James, Hanover & Westmoreland
5	St. Elizabeth & Manchester
6	Clarendon & St. Catherine

Appendix IV - Project Schools

School	EC/ MEC	Year Engaged	Region
Adelphi Primary	MEC	2013	4
Albert Town Primary and Infant	EC	2013	3
Askenish All Age	MEC	2013	4
Bethabara Primary and Junior High	MEC	2013	5
Bethel Primary	EC	2013	4
Bethlehem All Age and Infant	EC	2013	5
Brampton All Age	MEC	2013	3
Claremont All Age	MEC	2013	3
Claremont All Age	MEC	2013	4
Corinaldi Avenue Primary	EC	2013	4
Cornwall Mountain All Age	MEC	2013	4
Cove Primary	MEC	2013	4
Davis Primary	EC	2013	6
Falmouth All Age	MEC	2013	3
Garlands Primary and Junior High	MEC	2013	4
Hague Primary and Infant	EC	2013	3
Irwin Primary	EC	2013	4
John Rollins Success Primary and Junior High	EC	2013	4
Kendal Primary	MEC	2013	4
Little London Primary	EC	2013	4
Lottery Primary	MEC	2013	4
Lucea Primary	EC	2013	4

School	EC/MEC	Year Engaged	Region
Mount Nebo Primary	MEC	2013	6
Mount Rosser Primary and Infant	MEC	2013	6
New Green Primary and Junior High	MEC	2013	5
Niagara Primary	MEC	2013	4
Petersfield Primary and Infant	EC	2013	4
Pondside Primary	MEC	2013	4
Sheffield All Age	MEC	2013	4
Spring Garden Primary and Infant	MEC	2013	3
Ulster Spring Primary	MEC	2013	3
Wilson's Run All Age	MEC	2013	3
Aenon Town All	MEC	2014	6
Alligator Pond Primary and Infant	MEC	2014	5
Bryce Primary	EC	2014	5
Bull Savannah Primary and Infant	EC	2014	5
Chandlers Pen Primary and Junior High	MEC	2014	6
Crescent Primary	EC	2014	6
Elgin Primary	MEC	2014	6
Friendship Primary	EC	2014	6
Geneva Primary	MEC	2014	5
Gimme-me-bit Primary	MEC	2014	6
Guanaboa Vale Primary	MEC	2014	6
Guys Hill Primary	EC	2014	6
Hayes Primary and Junior High	EC	2014	6
Horizon Park Primary	EC	2014	6
Kitson Town All Age	EC	2014	6
Lititz All Age and Infant	MEC	2014	5
McAuley Primary	EC	2014	6
Mile Gully Primary	MEC	2014	5
Milk River Primary	MEC	2014	6
Mount Providence Primary	MEC	2014	6
Mt. Olivet Primary	MEC	2014	5
Patrick Town Primary	MEC	2014	5

School	EC/ MEC	Year Engaged	Region
Port Henderson Primary	EC	2014	6
Race Course Primary	EC	2014	6
Richmond Primary	MEC	2014	5
Robins Hall All-Age	MEC	2014	5
Rose Hall All Age	MEC	2014	5
Roses Valley Primary	MEC	2014	5
Slipe Leased Primary	MEC	2014	5
St. Mary's All Age	EC	2014	6
Thompson Town Primary and Infant	MEC	2014	6
Thornton Primary	MEC	2014	5
Treadlight Primary	EC	2014	6
Windsor Castle All Age	EC	2014	2
Zion Hill Primary	MEC	2014	5
Aeolus Valley All Age	MEC	2015	2
Albion Mountain Primary	MEC	2015	2
Annotto Bay Primary	EC	2015	2
Boscobel Primary	MEC	2015	2
Bull Bay All Age	MEC	2015	2
Cavaliers All Age	MEC	2015	1
Central Branch All Age	EC	2015	1
Cross Primary	EC	2015	6
Free Hill Primary and Infant	EC	2015	2
Gayle Primary	MEC	2015	2
Golden Spring Primary	EC	2015	1
Gregory Park Primary	EC	2015	6
Grove Primary	MEC	2015	1
Hampstead Primary	MEC	2015	2
John Mills Primary & Junior High and Infant	EC	2015	1
Johns Town Primary	MEC	2015	2
Linstead Primary and Junior High	EC	2015	6
Mason Hall Primary	MEC	2015	2
May Pen Primary	EC	2015	6
Mount Fletcher Primary	MEC	2015	1
Norman Gardens Primary and Junior High	EC	2015	1
Old Harbour Bay Primary	EC	2015	6

School	EC/ MEC	Year Engaged	Region
Orange Bay Primary	MEC	2015	2
Osbourne Store Primary and Junior High	EC	2015	6
Reach Primary and Infant	MEC	2015	2
Rennock Lodge All Age	MEC	2015	1
Rowlandsfield Primary	MEC	2015	2
Rural Hill Primary	MEC	2015	2
St. Andrew Primary	EC	2015	1
St. Anne's Primary	EC	2015	1
St. Benedict's Primary	EC	2015	1
Stony Hill Primary and Junior High and Infant	EC	2015	1
Swallowfield Primary and Junior High	MEC	2015	1
Tavares Gardens Primary	MEC	2015	1
Wallingford Primary	MEC	2015	2
Yallahs Primary	EC	2015	2
York Town Primary	EC	2015	6

Appendix V – List of Schools to Host Parent/Student Summer School Intervention 2015

Schools	Regions
Norman Gardens Primary & Junior High	1
Rennock Lodge All Age	1
Cavaliers All Age	1
St. Benedict's Primary	1
Boscobel Primary	2
Annotto Bay Primary School	2
Reach Primary and Infant	2

Aeolus Valley All Age	2
Orange Bay Primary	2
Ulster Spring Primary	3
Spring Garden Primary and Infant	3
Claremont All Age	3
Wilson's Run All Age	3
Lottery Primary School	4
Lucea Primary	4
Corinaldi Avenue Primary	4
Bethel Primary	4
Rose Hall All Age School	5
Slipe Leased Primary School	5
Bethlehem All Age and Infant	5
Bryce Primary School	5
Mount Nebo Primary	6
Friendship Primary School	6
Guys Hill Primary School	6
Milk River Primary School	6

Appendix VI – Detailed Inventories, ECs Cohorts 1 and 2